REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The foregoing Amendment and the following Request for Reconsideration are

submitted in response to the Office Action issued on May 27, 2003 (Paper No. 6) in

connection with the above-identified patent application, and are being filed within the first

month after the three-month shortened statutory period set for a response by the Office

Action.

Claims 106-157 are pending in the present application. Claims 106, 107, 111, 112,

134, and 135 stand rejected. All other claims are either allowable or allowable but for a

dependency on a rejected base claim. Claims 106, 107, 111, 134, 135, and 139 have been

amended. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added to the

application by the Amendment.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the

claims, consistent with the following remarks.

The Examiner has rejected claims 106, 107, 111, 112, 134, and 135 under 35 USC §

112, second paragraph as failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject

matter that Applicants regard as the invention. Applicants respectfully traverse the § 112

rejection insofar as it may be applied to the claims as amended.

The Examiner points to instances in claims 106, 107, 134, and 135 recited language is

considered to be unclear. Accordingly, Applicants have amended the recited language in a

manner intended to clarify same. The Examiner also points to "the basis" in claim 111 (and

claim 139) as being clear. Accordingly, Applicants have amended claims 111 and 139 to

recite that the first digital signature is based on the second encrypted key. As the relevant

public would appreciate, such phrase means that the calculation of the first digital signature is done at least in part over the second encrypted key.

The Examiner also points to a dual use of (PU-L) in claim 112 (actually claims 113 and 141) as being unclear. In particular, the designation of (PU-L) as both a public key and as content is confusing to the Examiner. However, Applicants respectfully point out that the claim language "having a public key (PU-L) and a private key (PR-L), and wherein the contents of the certificate is (PU-L)" merely means that the content of the certificate is the recited public key (PU-L).

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 112 rejection.

The Examiner has rejected claims 106 and 134 under 35 USC § 103 as being obvious over Cuccia (U.S. Patent No. 6,151,676). Applicants respectfully traverse the § 103 rejection.

Independent claim 106 recites a method for a device to interdependently validate a digital content package having a piece of digital content in an encrypted form and a corresponding digital license for rendering the digital content. In the method, a first key is derived from a pre-determined source, and a first digital signature is obtained from the digital content package. The first key is applied to the first digital signature to validate the first digital signature and the digital content package, and a second key is derived from a certificate corresponding to the first digital signature. A second digital signature is obtained from the license, and the second key is applied to the second digital signature to validate the second digital signature and the license. Independent claim 134 recites the subject matter of

claim 106 in the form of a computer-readable medium having instructions thereon for performing the method.

The Cuccia reference discloses a system for generating random numbers for us in connection with a network. The system in the course of generating and distributing such random numbers is disclosed as employing keys including public and private keys and the like, and also digital signatures. However, and significantly, the Cuccia reference otherwise utterly fails to disclose the particular method for interdependently validating as recited in claims 106 and 134.

In particular, the Cuccia system does not disclose or suggest interdependently validating a digital content package having a piece of digital content in an encrypted form and a corresponding digital license for rendering the digital content, as is required by claims 106 and 134, and does not apply a first key to a first digital signature from the digital content package to validate such first digital signature and such digital content package, as is also required by claims 106 and 134. Likewise, the Cuccia system does not disclose or suggest deriving a second key from a certificate corresponding to the first digital signature and applying such second key to a second digital signature from the license to validate such second digital signature and such license, as is required by claims 106 and 134.

Moreover, inasmuch as the Cuccia reference is concerned with generating and distributing random numbers and is not at all concerned with interdependently validating a digital content package and a corresponding digital license, the Cuccia reference does not at all disclose, suggest, or even mention that a digital content package should or could be interdependently validating in the manner set forth in claims 106 and 134. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the Cuccia reference cannot be applied to make such claims obvious.

Instead, Applicants respectfully submit that such claims are not in fact obvious in view of the

Cuccia reference, and accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and

withdrawal of the § 103 rejection.

In view of the foregoing discussion, Applicants respectfully submit that the present

application including claims 106-157 is in condition for allowance, and such action is

respectfully requested.

Date: September 16, 2003

Steven H. Meyer
Registration No. 37,189

Woodcock Washburn LLP
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor
Philadelphia PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439